

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-17 are requested to be cancelled. Claims 18-30 are being added as new claims. Support for new claims 18-30 can be found at least on pages 2-17 of the application as filed. No new matter has been added.

This amendment adds and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 18-30 are now pending in this application.

**Specification**

The specification was objected to for not having an Abstract. In response, Applicants have added a new Abstract attached to this document. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 1 was objected to for informalities. Claim 1 has been cancelled making the objection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-15 and 17 have been cancelled making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-15 and 17 have been cancelled making the rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 5-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackay et al., *The A-Book, An Augmented Laboratory Notebook for Biologists*, ERCIM News No. 46, July 2001 (hereinafter “Mackay”) in view of Butcher et al. (U.S. Patent 6,355,889, hereinafter “Butcher”). Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackay, in view of Butcher further in view of Fekete et al., *Using the Multi-Layer Model for Building Interactive Graphical Applications*, In Procs. Of UIST '96, 1996 (hereinafter “Fekete”). Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackay, in view of Butcher further in view of Chatani (U.S. Patent 5,590,107). Claims 13, 14, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackay, in view of Butcher further in view of Fitzmaurice, *Situated Information Spaces and Spatially Aware Palmtop*, Communications of the ACM, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, Vol. 36, No. 7, July 1, 1993 (from the IDS submitted April 21, 2005).

In response, without agreeing or acquiescing to the rejection, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-17 and added new claims 18-30. Claim 18 is an independent claim. Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants rely on MPEP § 2143.03, which requires that all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art. Here, the cited references do not identically disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Independent claim 1 is directed to a “data processing system” comprising, in addition to other elements:

“a user interface device having a surface being responsive to a writing of handwritten signs for generating first input digital data said first input digital data comprising sign data and position data, wherein said sign data represent a digital version of the handwritten signs and position data represent the position of the handwritten signs relative to said surface”,

“a personal digital assistant (PDA) having a PDA display and a PDA user input interface, said PDA being adapted to simultaneously display primary data on said PDA display and enable the entry of secondary data through said PDA user input interface, the personal digital assistant being responsive to the entry of secondary data for generating second input digital data, said second input digital data comprising the secondary data in association with the primary data”,

“processing code comprising a display function adapted to generate display digital data from the first input digital data, said display digital data being for use in said PDA display”,

“wherein: the personal digital assistant further includes tracking means adapted to determine PDA position data, such PDA position data representing the position of the PDA display relative to said surface of the user interface device”, and

“said display function in said processing code is arranged to perform a selection among the first input digital data based on the matching between position data and PDA position data, and to generate said display digital data from the sign data which correspond to said selection.” (Emphasis added).

According to the claimed system, the PDA displays the content of the surface of the user interface device which is located under the PDA display. That is, the PDA seems to be transparent. Therefore, the PDA can be used as a lens operating on the surface of the user interface device. Furthermore, the PDA can be used to input further data to be associated with the handwritten data on the surface of the user interface device.

In contrast, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest each and every element recited in independent claim 1. None of the cited documents discloses a personal

digital assistant comprising tracking means adapted to determine PDA position data, which represents the position of the PDA display relative to the surface of a user interface device in combination with a display function of processing code, which is arranged to perform a selection among input digital data, which have been input through the user interface device, wherein the selection is based on the matching between position data and PDA position data, so as to generate display digital data from data which has been handwritten on the surface of the user interface device, the sign data corresponding to said selection.

Mackay is directed to a computer-augmented lab notebook (“a-book”). The a-book allows a user to write on a notebook page while the a-book captures an electronic copy of the writing. However, Mackay fails to disclose, teach or suggest generating position data as claimed. In addition, Mackay fails to disclose a personal digital assistant in conjunction with the user interface device. The additional cited references fail to cure the deficiencies of Mackay.

Fitzmaurice discloses a map, as a completely passive element, and a PDA which discloses information related to the map according to the position of the PDA relative to the map, but not the surfaces of the map. Furthermore, the map cannot be considered as a user interface device as claimed in claim 1. As a result, Fitzmaurice fails to disclose the display of information on a PDA that corresponds to handwritten signs on a digital user interface. Butcher discloses a system to update information on a calendar with information data which are input through a pen and memorized when the data are written. As a result, Butcher provides a temporal correlation between the input data unlike the claimed system in which the data is spatially correlated. Fekete discloses a multilayer model but fails to disclose a combination of physical layers such as the surface of a sheet of paper, and the ink of handwritten signs on that sheet. Furthermore, Fekete fails to disclose the display of information according to the position of a PDA relative to the sheet of paper. Finally, Chatani fails to disclose the display of information on a PDA that corresponds to handwritten signs on a digital user interface in accordance with the position of the PDA relative to said digital user interface.

When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make “a searching comparison of the claimed invention – *including all its limitations* – with the teaching of the prior art.” *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (emphasis added). Thus, “obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim.” *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (*citing In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974)). Here, the cited references fail to disclose each and every limitation in as complete detail as is contained in independent claim 18.

Claims 19-30 depend from independent claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above without regard to further patentable limitations contained therein.

If this rejection of the claims is maintained, the examiner is respectfully requested to point out where the above-mentioned features are disclosed in the cited references.

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 12/2/10

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5416  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Brian J. McNamara  
Registration No. 32,789

W. Keith Robinson  
Registration No. 59,396

Attorneys for Applicants